

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR
(Through Virtual Mode)**

CM No. 306/2025 in
RP No. 6/2025

UT of J & K

.....Applicant(s)/Petitioner(s)

Through :- Mr. Wasim Gul, GA

v/s

Umar Ali Wani and Ors.

.....Respondent(s)

Through :- Mr. Abhirash Sharma, Advocate

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV KUMAR, JUDGE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SEKHRI, JUDGE**

**ORDER
26.09.2025**

CM No. 306/2025

1. RP No. 06/2025 is delayed by 21 days and, therefore, application for condonation of delay.
2. The application is not seriously opposed by learned counsel for the respondents. The application is, thus, allowed.
3. The delay in filing the review petition is condoned.

RP No. 6/2025

1. This petition filed by the Union Territory of J & K and J & K Services Selection Board seeks review of an order dated 19.11.2024 passed by this Court in WP (C) No. 2522/2024, whereby pending disposal of OA No. 592/2024, an interim arrangement was made.
2. The J & K Services Selection Board was directed to undertake an exercise to re-allocate districts to the non-applicants herein

and the candidates appointed from the waitlist strictly in accordance with the criteria adopted by the J & K Services Selection Board in the selection process.

3. Similar OA Nos. 1206/2024 and 1425/2024 which were pending before Jammu Bench of the Tribunal were disposed of by the Tribunal in terms of its judgment dated 12.06.2025 which were called in question by the UT of J & K and Ors. in WP (C) No. 2329/2025. This Court has, vide its judgment dated 01.09.2025 disposed of the writ petition by providing as under: -

i. The respondent, Service Selection Board, shall undertake an exercise to reallocate districts to the petitioners and the candidates appointed from the waitlist, strictly in accordance with the criteria adopted by the Service Selection Board in the present selection process.

ii. The result of this exercise shall be submitted by the Service Selection Board to the Tribunal.

iii. It is clarified that any appointment or joining of candidates from the waitlist, if made by the respondents in the interim period, shall be provisional and subject to the final orders of the Tribunal on the merits of the case.

4. In view of the aforesaid, the controversy which is subject matter of adjudication in OA has already been set at rest. The OA No. 592/2024 which is pending adjudication before the Tribunal too, has been virtually rendered infructuous.

5. In view of the above, we find no merit in this review petition and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Rajesh Sekhri)
Judge

(Sanjeev Kumar)
Judge

JAMMU
26.09.2025
Manik

